

I had a letter from a worker in my State who had worked hard for decades in building the party, in raising the small contributions, contributing the small contributions to the candidates. She wrote me a letter and said that it seems that that voice is being drowned out, the voice of the small contribution is being drowned out by the multinational corporations that are feeding our national political parties with literally millions of dollars of money. That was her impression. So if we restrain the big money interests, we empower the individual. That is what we are trying to do.

Many times the opponents to reform cite the Buckley versus Valeo decision. It is the United States Supreme Court decision that talks about free speech, that talks about campaign reform. They were evaluating the reform that was passed in the 1970s.

What the United States Supreme Court did in the Buckley versus Valeo decision was that it struck down limits on campaign spending, because spending was free speech. It struck down spending limits. Our bill does not do anything with spending. We do believe that it is appropriate that everyone spends money in campaigns because that is speech, that is free speech, that is first amendment privilege.

But the United States Supreme Court also said that it was consistent with the first amendment to restrict, have a reasonable restriction, on campaign contributions, so that is why they upheld the \$1,000 limit. It has been upheld, the corporate ban on contributions, and the labor union ban on contributions. They upheld the political action committees.

So there are reasonable restraints that can be made that are consistent with the first amendment. We restrain the voice of big money interests by limiting their contributions and their voice, and that strengthens and empowers the voice of the individual in American democracy.

Another thing we do to empower individuals is to empower them with information. That is the disclosure provisions, information as to where the candidates are getting their money, information as to what the issue advocacy groups are doing, who they are and how much money they are spending; who is trying to influence the elections.

A voter out there needs to be empowered with that information to make good decisions on who they are going to vote for, who the special interests are, who is trying to influence that particular candidate, so we empower that individual with the information.

Then we empower that individual, finally, by strengthening their voice, by strengthening their contribution, again, by indexing it to inflation, increasing their voice, increasing the amount that they can contribute to a candidate. So you empower individuals in our system of democracy. I believe that is significant reform. It is substantial reform. It is important for the voice of democracy.

What will happen down the road? What will happen if this is passed? If this legislation is passed by this body, first of all, I believe it gives tremendous momentum for campaign finance reform over in the other body, the United States Senate.

Secondly, besides giving that momentum, it will be held constitutional, because we have been careful to protect the first amendment, not to tread upon the rights of groups that are trying to influence the elections of this country, which is their first amendment rights. It will be held constitutional. I believe the President will sign it because it represents significant reform, so I think it can become law.

Also, once this is passed, we will empower individuals in our system of democracy, and I believe we will strengthen the role of the political parties. I am a former State party chairman, so I believe in political parties. I believe in their voice, and that their voice should not be drowned out.

However, I do not believe we ought to nationalize everything; that there is a role of the State party, a role of the national party, and there should be a balance between those. Our bill strengthens individuals, strengthens the political parties, strengthens their voices, and is a balance between the role of the candidates and the role of the issue advocacy groups. It represents significant reform.

Members might ask, is it a cure-all? Is this going to stop all the abuses? I am afraid it is not. Any law we pass out of this body, there might be someone who will sit and figure out exactly a way to get around or avoid it. We tried to eliminate those loopholes, but there is going to be a chance for reform down the road.

In the 1970s, four campaign reform bills passed this body, passed the Senate, and were signed into law, four of them. It has been decades since. We have an opportunity now to pass another law and have it signed into enactment. If we can do this, then it will set a pattern that, yes, we might want to review these laws again down the road. There might be some areas that the States need to address, but it is substantial reform. It is the first step to reform. It is reform that will give momentum to this effort and return democracy to the individual, and strengthen their role. That is what we want to accomplish.

When we look at the people that support campaign finance reform, from both sides of the aisle, Democrats and Republicans, former Presidents, from Gerald Ford to George Bush to Jimmy Carter, all have said that we ought to ban soft money. We have academics who look at this and say we ought to do that, and that we can do it constitutionally. Then we have leaders of reform, people from both sides of the aisle in this House, that support this.

Sure, there are opponents of this. They are going to try to kill it at every turn, but I think we have a great op-

portunity in this body to give something to the American people to fulfill our responsibility to them, and to fulfill our promises to them. When we do this in a bipartisan fashion, they will believe that we have done something good. It will reduce cynicism in America, it will increase confidence, and I believe that it is the most important thing we can do for the American citizens in this United States Congress.

Therefore, I ask my colleagues to support the Bipartisan Campaign Integrity Act. I hope that as we start this process, it will be an open and a fair procedure, one that we can say we are proud of; and that when we finish, when the day is done, we will say we have passed something that is good for the American public.

ONE OF AMERICA'S WORST NATIONAL SECURITY SCANDALS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MILLER of Florida). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 7, 1997, the gentleman from California (Mr. ROHRBACHER) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. ROHRBACHER. Mr. Speaker, what started off as leaks about American corporations upgrading Communist Chinese rockets and missiles is today emerging as one of our country's worst national security scandals.

What could be worse than American corporations using technology, paid for by the American taxpayer, to improve Communist Chinese missiles and rockets so they will have a better chance of striking the United States with nuclear weapons?

What is worse than having government watchdogs go after companies engaged in this betrayal of the American people, and to have the prosecution of those responsible undercut by an executive action taken by none other than President Bill Clinton?

What is worse than to find out that the executive that gave the missile technology to the Communist Chinese, as well as the Communist Chinese themselves, I might add, donated a million dollars to the President's reelection effort at the time the missile deal was in play?

Mr. Speaker, the American people have bent over backwards so many times to give their President the benefit of the doubt. Many think the attention paid to sex scandals swirling through this administration are a waste of time, even a joke, never mind that the liberal establishment destroyed the career of Bob Packwood, Senator Bob Packwood from Oregon, just a few short years ago on allegations which were far less than what now face the President; and they also, this same liberal establishment, tried just a few short years ago to destroy the career of Justice Clarence Thomas with charges far less significant than those that are now being made against the President.

□ 1230

Also I might add that a number of military careers have been destroyed by such sex scandals. Officers have been thrown out of their job, after serving many, many years with the military, by the claim that they must have the highest level of integrity, they must have the highest level of character, if they are to be trusted with the defense of our country, especially when it concerns nuclear weapons. But the double standard at the very top, of course, is a bit overwhelming, to say the least.

Again, of course, the charges against the President now being investigated center on allegations that the President encouraged a young lady to lie under oath on a legal deposition, read that commit perjury. And, okay, it does go back to the sexual proclivities of the President and also, the American people admittedly are getting tired of seeing the pandering of the news media—

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MILLER of Florida). The Chair would remind the Member to refrain from making personal references toward the President of the United States.

Mr. ROHRABACHER. I was not aware that I was making personal references to the President of the United States but, instead, about investigations into the President's proclivities. I believe that any mention about investigations is certainly possible. I would like to know what Member is objecting to my words.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair took the initiative in this reference to the President.

Mr. ROHRABACHER. I will take the Chair's admonition and interest.

We recognize that the media has trivialized the charges that have been made against the President and we realize that perhaps the American people are getting sick and tired of hearing about charges that go back to sexual activities that the President may or may not have been engaged in. And if what Ken Starr has been investigating seems complicated and now trivial, let us not lose sight of the fact that something now is emerging in Washington that is not trivial, that does not deal with a sex scandal, that what we are seeing emerge about this administration's dealings with the Red Chinese is both understandable and outrageous.

In short, President Clinton's White House has been in collusion with American high tech companies that have transferred to the Communist Chinese missile and rocket technology that increased their capability of successfully launching a nuclear strike against the United States of America. So while the news media was paying attention to charges and investigations that may go back to the President's sex life, let us not ignore or let us focus on something that everybody should be able to understand, the magnitude of which ev-

eryone should be able to understand, every man, woman and child in our country has been put at risk by actions of a few profit-oriented aerospace tycoons.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. If the gentleman would suspend, the Chair would like to request that the Member not refer to the President of the United States in the personal manner that he just utilized. The gentleman may proceed.

Mr. ROHRABACHER. I would appeal the ruling of the Chair if it says that I am not permitted—I do not know who is telling the Chair that no one is permitted to talk about the policies of the President of the United States and use them as policies of the President of the United States.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. It was the references to the President's personal conduct rather than the policies of the President.

Mr. ROHRABACHER. Even if those personal positions are being investigated by a law enforcement agency?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. That is correct.

Mr. ROHRABACHER. Well, then I will refrain from that and I thank the Chair for pointing that out to me. I thought that referring to an investigation of the President in that area was permitted, and I will refrain from referring to that in the rest of my speech. Instead, I will refer to exactly what this speech is supposed to focus on and as only compared to those other items that I consider to be not understandable and trivial, but instead the fact that actions have been taken by this President that benefit aerospace tycoons that have put our country at risk.

The President, this President, may well have squashed attempts to prosecute people who have betrayed the safety and security of our country. This story started for me earlier this year when I first got wind of the assistance being provided to the Communist Chinese missile and rocket program.

As chairman of the space subcommittee, it is part of my job to keep track of America's space program. I am, in fact, as chairman of the space subcommittee, the point man in the House of Representatives in overseeing NASA and other space and technology budgets. I have, thus, some understanding of rockets and missiles that perhaps some others of our Members do not have.

Several years ago it was argued that American satellites should be permitted to be launched atop foreign rockets; that is, if the foreign customer, which American companies were selling their satellites to, demanded that those launches be made to those foreign, be made on top of those foreign rockets. That request by American satellite manufacturers made sense. We were competitive with the British and French as well as the Russians and, when quality was put into

the equation, we were far superior; meaning American rockets were far superior to the Chinese long march rockets, which is their standard rocket for the Chinese arsenal.

So, thus, this Congress moved forward with the President of the United States to make legal the launching of American satellites on top of foreign rockets but with great restrictions to be placed on those satellite launches so that there would be no technology transfer.

As I say, I agreed with that position because I knew that once the long march rocket, which at that time was blowing up three out of four times, was used to put up an American satellite, people would soon see that it made no economic sense to use long march rockets. At no time did this Congress or anyone else ever suggest that American technology should be used to perfect Chinese long march rockets or to upgrade any Chinese missile system. But that is exactly what happened.

When the Chinese rockets failed, as predicted, the Chinese rockets, as I say, would go up and they would explode, reminiscent of the American, early American rockets of the 1950s. And as predicted, they blew up, and at that point most of us believed that the launches of American satellites to set up things like a telephone system in China and such, which are totally justified sales of technology, that they would have to be launched on American rockets. Yet some high rollers in certain American aerospace companies decided to upgrade the capability of the Communist Chinese in their ability to launch those rockets without any consideration of America's national security interests.

What may have been given to the Chinese? What is it that we are talking about when we are talking about a rocket system, the long march rocket that used to blow up and was totally unreliable and now is a reliable rocket system?

Well, what we gave them, what it looks like we may have given them, I should say, is missile command and control technology, missile guidance systems, stage separation technology and MIRVing technology. Demonstrating just how far things have gone in perfecting the long march rocket, on May 2 of this year, two Motorola satellites were put into orbit with one long march rocket.

To explain the importance of this, to understand the importance of this, we need to look at what technology is needed to send two satellites up on the same rocket.

First of all, those rockets were exploding. As one Motorola executive told me, Well, Mr. Chairman, as the rockets go up, they did not have the stage separation technology and they were blowing up when they were supposed to separate.

My reaction, of course, was, it is a very good thing that Red Chinese rockets blow up. We like them to blow up.

We do not want them to have an effective rocket system.

What it also tells us, the May 2 launch, is, they have overcome that stage separation problem now. One long march rocket put two satellites up; the important phrase, "two satellites." That means that the Red Chinese now have MIRV capacity. They are utilizing MIRV technology.

To put this in perspective, that means that the Chinese, before any policies laid down by the President or in support of these companies, before they had an unreliable rocket system that would blow up three out of four times, now they have a system that will launch into space not only one satellite but two.

Now let us change the name. We are no longer talking about satellites. We are talking about nuclear warheads. The Chinese now, because it is the very same technology used to spit out those satellites, is the same technology that is used to spit out nuclear warheads. The Chinese now, using American technology, have the ability to launch, effectively launch nuclear warheads. And not just one warhead per rocket, they now have our MIRV technology that will permit them to launch numerous nuclear warheads at the United States per rocket, using our technology paid for by the American taxpayers.

Where were our watchdogs? When all of this was happening, where were our watchdogs? Well, this did not pass the attention of many long-time pros over at the CIA and the State Department and U.S. Customs. Our watchdogs were actually on the job and could not help but notice that the Chinese capability in their launching of their rockets and missiles was improving dramatically. In fact, moves have been made by our watchdogs to bring charges against several corporations that may have transferred this American technology to the Communist Chinese.

But in the midst of the preparation for bringing criminal charges, our President, President Bill Clinton, inexplicably issued two licenses that made it legal to sell that same technology to the Communist Chinese, undercutting the potential prosecutions of those who had been engaged in selling the same technology to them before.

This might be viewed as almost a retroactive licensing or waiver for past illegal activities. This is something we need to, as a Congress, to look into exactly what was behind that. When examining this issue, we need to also understand that the transfer of technology financed by the American taxpayer is a double betrayal of the American people.

First, let us understand that when you transfer American technology like rocket technology, American jobs are being destroyed and, second, our country is being put in jeopardy.

First, what about the jobs? I represent an area in Southern California in which aerospace plays a major role

in our economy. Tens of thousands of people make their living in the aerospace industry. By transferring technology that was paid for by the taxpayers to the Chinese so that launches will be given to the Chinese rather than to Americans, we are betraying everyone who works in our aerospace industry.

When I say "we," it comes down to some of the bigwigs in the aerospace industry who are not considering their employees and some as well in the administration, the Clinton administration that are supposed to be making the decisions as to what is in the interest of our country. But of course, our relations with China over these last five years have been based on transferring jobs and wealth from the United States to Communist China.

□ 1245

How many people know that, when our companies are trying to sell a product in China, they have to pay a 30 or 40 percent tariff? The Chinese, on the other end, are flooding our markets with consumer goods and paying a 3 percent or 4 percent tariff. This is no accident. This is no mistake.

What does that do? That undercuts the ability of American companies, of American workers to do their job and to earn their living. So we have tariffs that are totally out of whack, and that is no accident.

Then we have got OPIC, Export-Import Bank, the World Bank and several other financial institutions that are financed by the American taxpayer. And what do we have? We have the taxpayer, again, subsidizing the building of a manufacturing plant in a Communist country, especially Communist China, which is the biggest human rights abuser on this planet.

Again, we have a policy that betrays the American people by taxing them in order to subsidize or guarantee loans to big corporations who will then build a plant in China to use slave labor, which will then be used to transfer goods or to sell goods to the United States, undercutting our own working people and putting them out of a job.

This is nonsense. This is bizarre. Who is watching out for the interests of the American people? Even environmental deals that we have been talking about, trying to set up environmental standards internationally, we managed to maneuver them and to work through problems and to negotiate.

When all the smoke clears away from the negotiations, we find we have a deal in which China and several other countries are excluded from harsh restrictions that are put on our country, which means that, when people invest in the future, they will invest in China instead of investing in the United States.

That is very predictable. No one can deny that. This is what will happen if these Kyoto treaties that we just negotiated, when it is implemented, it is the most massive transfer of wealth from the United States to China.

Why not? If you have so many restrictions in the United States and it is so costly to do business here, why not put your investment into China? Let us bend over backwards again and give those involved in this strategy the benefit of the doubt of why it is happening. Let us say that we are going to give everybody the benefit of the doubt that these nonsensical and horrible policies have been brought about by the best of intentions.

What they really want to do, or so they say, is to bring China into the family of nations. This is the way to bring China into the family of nations. Let us make China part of the global economy. The more business that we do with China, the more they are going to come and be more like western countries.

This is, let us hug a Nazi, and he is going to come along and not be a Nazi any more. Let us trade with Hitler, and then he will not want to invade Poland. Let us make sure that the Communists and the Nazis and the fascists do not feel threatened, do not feel threatened by anything that we do. Let us give them all of our weapons or at least let us not build any new weapons and so they will know they have nothing to fear from the United States.

This is the kind of nonsense that is at the basis of one of the worst betrayals of the interests of the American people that I have seen in my lifetime. Massive transfers of wealth and technology, even weapons technology, to the worst human rights abuser and worst potential aggressor on this planet.

China, the Chinese dictatorship, could incinerate all of Tibet; and these nincompoops making these arguments would still be arguing that we have got to prove our sincerity and maintain this unequal trade relationship with the Chinese.

In fact, the Communist Chinese are, at this moment, engaged in genocide against the people of Tibet, slowly but surely trying to replace them, totally replace them from that kingdom in the mountains overlooking India and China.

But even those who espouse this nonsense of encouraging an unequal relationship with China understand that this strategy does not excuse the transfer of weapons technology and technology of mass destruction to the Communist Chinese.

One of the most disturbing tidbits of information that has been coming to the surface now that this issue is being focused on by some of us in Congress was the effort of the Loral Corporation to ship other sophisticated weapon systems over to the Communist Chinese.

Even beyond the missiles and rockets, when former Secretary of Commerce Ron Brown went to Communist China, he was accompanied by Loral CEO Bernie Schwartz, who carried with him a list that has been compared to a catalog of high-tech weapons put out by the James Defense Publishers.

I have a list here of some of the weapons that Loral suggested be sold to the Communist Chinese. They include Airborne Reconnaissance Cameras, Weapon Delivery, Target Acquisition, Missile Guidance, Shipboard Target Acquisition, Radar Warning, Missile Warning, RF Jamming, IR Jamming.

Loral's list proposed the sale to Red China, also included some of our most deadly weapons in our inventory, including the AIM-9 Sidewinder, the massive missile artillery weapon MLRS, the Army's newest antimissile missile, the ERINT, the anti-aircraft missile Chaparral, and even the advanced unmanned air vehicle called the Predator.

Loral also made sure that the list of ever-popular add-ons for jet fighters would include things such as laser bomb targeting pods, FLIR, Forward Looking Infra-Red, night vision and smart bomb targeting gear.

This is only a partial list of what Loral apparently would like to have sold to Communist Chinese.

Where would those weapons be used? First of all, I do not believe that it is justified for the United States to sell weaponry to any dictatorship. The Cold War is over.

It is time for the United States to set a standard that, if a country is not ruled by a democracy, by the people themselves, if there are not democratic rights and people, and you have a small clique of dictators running a country, we should not be selling weapons to that government, because those weapons will be used, among other things, to continue the suppression of their own people.

But, also, we know that dictatorships are actually more inclined towards aggression than are democratic countries. So we have here a company and maybe several companies that was seeking to make huge profits by selling sophisticated weapons to the world's worst human rights abuser, what I consider to be one of the world's worst dictatorships, even though it does permit our big boys to come in and make millions of dollars of profit if they can cut the right deal with the ruling clique.

Later, when the State Department began pointing out the potential danger to America of transferring these weapons, now, remember, all these weapons, someday we may be in a conflict with the Chinese, and those early defense systems and those radar systems may be used to shoot down American pilots, and that did not escape the attention of some of the people in our government, some of the watchdogs.

When some of our watchdogs began to raise questions about the transfer of these weapons, President Clinton, again, inexplicably gave the Commerce Department authority over the approval of certain of these strategic systems. It was no longer the State Department but the Commerce Department under Ron Brown then would have the ability to approve these trans-

fers or at least some of these transfers of weapons.

Why did that happen? It made it easier to transfer these weapons, this American technology, because the State Department was taking a harder line than Secretary of Commerce Ron Brown.

Why did Loral want to transfer these weapons in the first place? The missile and rocket technology, why did Loral want to provide this to the Chinese? Today, Hughes Technology, Hughes Corporation, that is one of the companies that are being accused of helping the Chinese upgrade their rockets, they vehemently deny that they have ever transferred any technology or that they did anything to upgrade the technology of the Communist Chinese. Hughes Technology has denied that. Unless it is proven otherwise, I would choose to believe that Hughes is telling the truth in this particular case.

Loral, on the other hand, Mr. Schwartz has been around Capitol Hill in the last couple of weeks; and from what I understand, he has told people that what he did is not illegal. That is the defense. It was not illegal.

Of course, we need to know whether or not it was illegal at the time this transfer of technology took place and the rockets, Chinese Communist rockets and missiles were upgraded. We need to know whether it was legal at that time, and when did it become legal for it to happen, and why did it become legal for us to transfer technology to a Communist dictatorship which enables them to launch nuclear weapons against the United States.

But is there not even a question here beyond what is legal? Is it wrong for us to expect that American businessmen have some sort of moral considerations in what they are doing?

I fought here for years trying to convince the American business community that we should not be making a fast buck in Communist China while Christians are being persecuted, while you have got massacres going on at Tiananmen Square and the Muslims in the far reaches of China and with the Tibetans.

Is it not immoral with us to go over and do business with a Hitler-like regime, even though they are permitting us to set up a company there? Is that not immoral? Should we not have some moral considerations about this?

The businessmen always come to me and say, oh, forget that. That is so much hogwash. We are going to make them more liberal because we are going to be there with our values on the scene. That will affect these Chinese decision makers.

I want my colleagues to know that over 50 American businessmen have made that argument to me, and I have asked almost all of them the same question: When you have been to China, have you ever raised the human rights issue with the government officials in the area in which you are manufacturing? I have asked that question.

Guess how many American businessmen have answered in the affirmative? Oh, I have stepped forward, and I have advocated what Americans should advocate. I have advocated freedom with these people, and I have told these local officials they should not be closing down the local churches. They should not be throwing believers in jail, and they should not be suppressing freedom of speech. I stood up for that with these local officials.

Not one American businessman has ever told me that. Not one.

Now we have come to the point we have blurred right and wrong. We have blurred the difference between a dictatorship and a democracy so that our businessmen do not even know the difference between giving technology to a Communist Chinese dictatorship that would threaten every man, woman, and child in this country with nuclear incineration.

Ladies and gentlemen, make no doubt about it, today we are in greater peril because American technology has been given to a Communist dictatorship which will enable them to deliver nuclear weapons to the United States more effectively.

Does someone not have a moral obligation not to do that to his friends and neighbors? I do not say that we always have to run across the street and help someone who is being attacked by thugs. At least we should call the police. But, at the very least, we should not sell the thugs brass knuckles so that they can beat up the fellow even more, so they can beat up our family.

Some of these questions are important questions, not only the legal ones but also the moral questions. The moral questions need to be asked as well, and there will be hearings on the subject.

Why was this administration greasing the skids for this dastardly activity? As I say, Hughes Corporation denies that there was any transfer on their part and that they did not do anything. So skip back to Bernie Schwartz and Loral who now claim that, well, I did this or I did some of these things, but it was legal.

Why did the administration go along with it? Why did the administration act in a way that undercut the investigation, the prosecution of Loral for jeopardizing the American people's safety?

It is my sad duty, and I hope that this is permitted, to note that Bernard Schwartz, CEO of Loral Corporation, was the biggest single contributor to President Clinton's reelection effort with over \$1 million in direct contribution and soft money being given by Mr. Bernard Schwartz to the Democratic Party.

Was this the reason that the President acted in a way that would undercut the prosecution of Loral for transferring weapons technology, nuclear rocket technology to the Communist Chinese? I cannot say that. We can never say absolutely. But it is something that we need to think about, and

we need to ask questions about it and need to get to the bottom of it.

Then, in the last 2 days, we hear about Johnny Chung. During the election we all remember that name back there somewhere. Republicans were yelling about a guy named Johnny Chung. Now we find out, and from recent articles, that Johnny Chung, this Democrat wheeler and dealer, had \$100,000 that he gave to the Democrats. Of course, they gave some of it back after Republicans raised a stink.

But this \$100,000 that he transferred to Democratic coffers, where did Johnny Chung's money come from? We now find out it came from the People's Liberation Army in Communist China. If you look closer, it was not just the People's Liberation Army in Communist China. That was not just the source of the money. It was a lieutenant colonel in the People's Liberation Army who is deeply involved in the development of their missiles and rockets. That is where Johnny Chung's money came. That is just what we know. That is all we know. We know about that one source.

We do not know that there might be other sources, hundreds of thousands of other dollars that were transferred into the President's political coffers by the Communist Chinese during his reelection. This is perhaps one of the most dastardly acts that I have seen in just giving missile technology. That in and of itself is a dastardly act, giving missile technology to the Communist Chinese.

But that this administration not only did not act to stop it but seems to have acted in a way that greased the skids should be of concern to all Americans. This is a scandal that will not stop until we know the information.

Mr. Speaker, I apologize if earlier that I made reference to some things that I was not supposed to make reference to. I, in fact, was referencing those things to say that what we are talking about today is so much more important and so much more understandable than those other things that the President was accused of.

My intent was not to talk about the President's personal life. Instead, it was to focus on the actions of the President, as he has taken actions that affect the life and security of each and every American, the life and security of our country. Nowhere is that more clear than in this issue of technology transfer.

Again, let me close now by talking a little bit about what I consider the basic issue. We have already pointed out that, number one, there has been a transfer of technology paid for by the American people through our tax dollars to the Communist Chinese that have helped perfect their nuclear weapons delivery systems, something that goes to the heart of the security and safety of every American.

We pointed out that those corporations, that when the watchdogs in our government have begun to try to put

together a prosecution of those involved with this breach of our security, perhaps the breaking of our law, that an action taken by the President may have undercut that prosecution. People are concerned about that.

We have also shown that at least one major corporate leader involved with this transfer of American technology was the largest contributor to President Clinton's reelection effort and that we have also shown that there is evidence that Communist Chinese money was transferred into that reelection effort as well.

But let us get right back to where it comes in. Why is this happening? This President, and people should not forget that, when this President first ran for office, he campaigned saying that President Bush was too soft on the Communist Chinese. AL GORE made statements saying that President Bush had coddled the Chinese.

By the way, that quotation by Vice-President GORE was made because President Bush had agreed, and this was before Tiananmen Square, to permit certain satellites to be launched on Chinese rockets. AL GORE characterized that during the election in 1992 as coddling these Communist dictators.

I will have to admit that my reaction to President Clinton's election was not as harsh as some of the other Republicans. I, in fact, had been disappointed with President Bush that he did not take a tougher stand against the Communist Chinese.

I thought, well, gee, here is one area that I can work with this new President, and maybe he believes in human rights, which is the rhetoric that we were hearing during the election.

Mr. Speaker, after becoming President of the United States, President Clinton immediately reversed his position on human rights in China. Most Favored Nation's status, all of a sudden, he has become this city's most potent advocate of Most Favored Nation's status for China. He, in fact, when we were out of session for a week, announced, from now on, there would be no trade negotiations with Communist China in which human rights would even be brought up by the administration as part of those negotiations, something that President Bush and every president had done up until that point.

In short, this administration immediately raced in the opposite direction it claimed that it would take when President Clinton was running for reelection. This is not the only example of that, but because we are talking about Chinese policy and the consequences of the Chinese policy, I thought I would bring that up today.

What we are really talking about is the fact that our government is not watching out for the interests of the American people.

We can talk about changing the rules. I know the fellow who spoke right before I got up today was talking about changing the campaign finance

rules. Right now, we have laws governing the election laws that thick. As long as we are relying on laws rather than trying to elect people with character, the American people will still suffer the kind of betrayals that we are talking about today.

What we are talking about is a blurring of right and wrong, a blurring of the distinctions between democratic governments and Communist governments, a blurring of the very basic moral fiber of our decision, moral fiber of our people, and the moral basis of our decision making.

What we are talking about today also is an idea that, in some way, our elected people should be furthering the cause of some global strategy, rather than watching out for the interests of the American people.

When you blur the moral distinctions and you forget the interest of the American people, we are asking for the kind of economic betrayals and, yes, even national security betrayals that are encompassed in my remarks today.

The United States of America is the leading force and has been the leading force for democracy and honor and decency since our inception. That is what the founding of our country was all about.

Our country was about average people having rights that are given by God and that government having no power except that which was given to the government by the consent of the governed. Our government and our country was supposed to be an example to the rest of the world. When we get away from that, from those concepts that our Founding Fathers wanted us to be, and if we start weakening our own people, instead of being the champion of democracy, our country will be a weak milk cow to the interest, special interests for them to make money in projects all over the world. There is something wrong with that.

Our American people do not have the same opportunities. The American middle class do not have the same opportunities as they had because we have intentionally permitted other countries to establish the rules of trade which suck wealth out of the pockets of our middle class and put them into other countries to build those countries.

I say that those countries will never, will never rise up and never be part of a worthwhile global economy until they have had the reforms that are necessary for democratic government to exist in their countries.

We cannot make Communist China into a democratic China by ignoring the dictatorial nature of their regime that controls that people and shoveling money out of the pockets of our middle class and jobs out of our own cities into the mainland of China. That strategy will not work. It is an immoral strategy. It is a strategy that is a betrayal of our people.

I would hope today that, as this crisis and this scandal emerges, and the outrage of the American people, that their

safety has just been put at risk, that they have been put at risk and that their safety has not been taken into consideration, that when this outrage sweeps America and they know their children and their families are now in jeopardy and in jeopardy because American technology has been placed in the hands of dictators, I hope that they will take a look a little deeper at some of the coverage of our news media into the frivolous scandals that I talked about earlier. And I am sorry if I made a personal reference to the President, but that is there.

They have been turned off, perhaps, at looking at some of the things that we are doing here that are important to their security. America has got to wake up. Americans have got to understand, or we are never going to be able to put a stop to this. This is only the first of many examples of where technology they paid for is being put to use to defeat them, to defeat their security, and to defeat the prosperity of this country.

With that, Mr. Speaker, I would hope that, before President Clinton goes to China, that we get to the bottom of this. The leadership in this House have committed themselves to hearings on this issue. I would hope that the American people would call their colleagues or their representatives, my colleagues, and to demand that we get to the bottom of this missile technology transfer before the President goes to China next month.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. FILNER) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. EDWARDS, today, for 5 minutes.

Mr. FILNER, today, for 5 minutes.

(The following Member (at the request of Mr. WOLF) to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. WOLF, today, for 5 minutes.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to revise and extend remarks was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. FILNER) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. KIND.

Mr. SERRANO.

Mr. ROEMER.

Mr. VISCLOSKY.

Mr. RANGEL.

Mr. OBEY.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. WOLF) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. CAMP.

Mr. SOLOMON.

Mr. NEY.

SENATE BILL REFERRED

A bill of the Senate of the following title was taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 1525. An act to provide financial assistance for higher education to the dependents of Federal, State, and local public safety officers who are killed or permanently and totally disabled as the result of a traumatic injury sustained in the line of duty; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. ROHRBACHER. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 1 o'clock and 15 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, May 19, 1998, at 10:30 a.m. for morning hour debates.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

9168. A letter from the Congressional Review Coordinator, Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service, transmitting the Service's final rule—Mediterranean Fruit Fly; Addition to Quarantined Area [Docket No. 97-056-12] received May 15, 1998, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

9169. A letter from the Director, Office of Procurement and Property Management, transmitting the Office's final rule—Agriculture Acquisition Regulation: Preference for selected biobased products (RIN: 0599-AA00) received May 13, 1998, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

9170. A letter from the Director, Office of Regulatory Management and Information, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—OMB Approval Numbers Under the Paperwork Reduction Act [FRL-6013-2] received May 14, 1998, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

9171. A letter from the Director, Office of Regulatory Management and Information, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans; Michigan [MI67-01-7275; FRL-6003-6] received May 14, 1998, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

9172. A letter from the Director, Office of Regulatory Management and Information, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plan; Illinois [IL169-1a; FRL-6012-7] received May 14, 1998, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

9173. A letter from the Director, Office of Congressional Affairs, Nuclear Regulatory Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule—Physical Protection for Spent Nuclear Fuel and High-Level Radioactive Waste (RIN: 3150-AF32) received May 14, 1998, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

9174. A letter from the Acting Director, Defense Security Assistance Agency, transmitting notification concerning the Department of the Army's Proposed Letter(s) of Offer and

Acceptance (LOA) to Greece for defense articles and services (Transmittal No. 98-26), pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2776(b); to the Committee on International Relations.

9175. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting certification of a proposed license for the export of defense articles or defense services sold under a contract to Chile (Transmittal No. DTC-40-98), pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2776(c); to the Committee on International Relations.

9176. A letter from the Executive Director, Committee For Purchase From People Who Are Blind Or Severely Disabled, transmitting the Committee's final rule—Procurement List; Additions—received May 15, 1998, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight.

9177. A letter from the Chairman, Board of Directors, Tennessee Valley Authority, transmitting a report of activities under the Freedom of Information Act from January 1, 1997 to September 30, 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 552(d); to the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight.

9178. A letter from the Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule—Fisheries off West Coast States and in the Western Pacific; Pacific Coast Groundfish Fishery; Trip Limit Increases [Docket No. 971229312-7312-01; I.D. 042398C] received May 15, 1998, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Resources.

9179. A letter from the Assistant Administrator for Fisheries, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's "Major" final rule—Magnuson-STEVENSON Act Provisions; National Standard Guidelines [Docket No. 970708168-8073-02; I.D. 061697B] received May 14, 1998, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Resources.

9180. A letter from the Chief, Regulations Unit, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule—Service-Initiated Accounting Method Changes (Notice 98-31) received May 15, 1998, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

9181. A letter from the Chief, Regulations Unit, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule—Electronic Funds Transfer—Temporary Waiver of Failure to Deposit Penalty for Certain Taxpayers (Notice 98-39) received May 15, 1998, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

9182. A letter from the Chief, Regulations Unit, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule—Distribution of Stock and Securities of a Controlled Corporation [26 CFR 1.355-2] received May 14, 1998, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. ARCHER. Committee on Ways and Means. H.R. 3433. A bill to amend the Social Security Act to establish a Ticket to Work and Self-Sufficiency Program in the Social Security Administration to provide beneficiaries with disabilities meaningful opportunities to return to work and to extend Medicare coverage for such beneficiaries, and to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide a tax credit for impairment-related work expenses; with amendments (Rept.